

OCT 01 '96 02:45PM ARNOLD, WHITE, & DURKEE

P.1

ARNOLD, WHITE & DURKEE

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

Attorneys at Law

750 BERING DRIVE, SUITE 400
HOUSTON, TX 77057-2198
TELEPHONE +1 (713) 787-1400
FACSIMILE +1 (713) 788-2678

155 LINFIELD DRIVE
MENLO PARK, CA 94025-3741
TELEPHONE +1 (415) 814-4500
FACSIMILE +1 (415) 614-4599

4850 FIRST BANK PLACE
601 SECOND AVE. SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-4329
TELEPHONE +1 (612) 321-1800
FACSIMILE +1 (612) 321-9600

1800 ONE AMERICAN CENTER
500 CONGRESS AVENUE
AUSTIN, TX 78701-3429
TELEPHONE +1 (512) 418-3000
FACSIMILE +1 (512) 474-7577

800 QUAKER TOWER
321 NORTH CLARK STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60610-4714
TELEPHONE +1 (312) 744-0090
FACSIMILE +1 (312) 755-4489

2001 JEFFERSON DAVIS HWY, SUITE 401
ARLINGTON, VA 22202-3804
TELEPHONE +1 (703) 415-1720
FACSIMILE +1 (703) 415-1728

OFFICIAL

FAX CENTER
RECEIVED

OCT 01 1996

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

GROUP 1800

TRANSMISSION FROM: XEROX 7020 -- (512) 474-7577

If any difficulties occur during transmission, please contact the operator at (512) 418-3068.

DATE: October 1, 1996
TO: Examiner Gary Benzion
COMPANY: PTO, Group 1803
AT FAX NO.: (703) 305-7362
FROM: David Parker

FILE: DEKM:055

SENDER'S PHONE: 512-418-3000

NO. OF PAGES TO FOLLOW: 10

COMMENTS:

08/113 561

1800

Benzion

ORIGINAL: Will not follow

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE

The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission contain information from the law firm of Arnold, White & Durkee which may be confidential and/or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named on this transmission sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this faxed information is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so that we can arrange for the retrieval of the original documents at no cost to you.

ARNOLD, WHITE & DURKEE

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

Attorneys at Law

POST OFFICE BOX 4433

HOUSTON, TX 77210-4433

760 BERING DRIVE, SUITE 400

HOUSTON, TX 77067-2198

TELEPHONE (713) 787-1400

FACSIMILE (713) 788-2678

1800 ONE AMERICAN CENTER
600 CONGRESS AVENUE
AUSTIN, TX 78701-3848
TELEPHONE (512) 418-3000
FACSIMILE (512) 474-7277155 LINFIELD DRIVE
MENLO PARK, CA 94025-3741
TELEPHONE (415) 614-4800
FACSIMILE (415) 614-45994850 FIRST BANA PLACE
601 SECOND AVE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-4320
TELEPHONE (612) 321-2800
FACSIMILE (612) 321-9800800 QUAKER TOWER
331 NORTH CLARK STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60610-4714
TELEPHONE (312) 744-0090
FACSIMILE (312) 755-44882001 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
SUITE 401
ARLINGTON, VA 22202-3604
TELEPHONE (703) 415-1720
FACSIMILE (703) 415-1728

DEKM:055

October 1, 1996

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE
37 C.F.R. 1.6(d)I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via
facsimile (703) 305-7362 (to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents,
Washington, D.C. 20231, on the date below:

October 1, 1996

Date

David L. Parker

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
ATTN: BOX AF
Washington, D.C. 20231RE: SN 08/113,561 "METHODS AND COMPOSITIONS FOR THE
PRODUCTION OF STABLY TRANSFORMED, FERTILE MONOCOT
PLANTS AND CELLS THEREOF"-- Adams *et al.*

Dear Sir:


Attached for filing in the above-referenced patent application is a Supplemental Petition Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, 1.127 and 1.181. This Supplemental Petition is being filed with the Patent and Trademark Office to correct typographical errors inadvertently included in the Petition which was originally filed on September 23, 1996. Also attached is Appendix A, listing the aforementioned errors.

ARNOLD, WHITE & DURKEE

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
October 1, 1996
Page 2

Appellants believe that there are no fees required in connection with the filing of these documents. However, should any fees be deemed necessary under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 to 1.21 for any reason relating to the enclosed materials, the Assistant Commissioner is authorized to deduct said fees from Arnold, White & Durkee Deposit Account No. 01-2508/DEKM:055/PAR.

Respectfully submitted,



David L. Parker
Reg. No. 32, 165

Attorney for Appellants

PAR/NAK:kr
Enclosures

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE


In re Application of:
Adams *et al.*

Serial No.: 08/113,561

Filed: August 25, 1993

For: METHODS AND COMPOSITIONS
FOR THE PRODUCTION OF
STABLY TRANSFORMED,
FERTILE MONOCOT PLANTS
AND CELLS THEREOF

§
§
§ Group Art Unit: 1804
§
§ Examiner: G. Benzion
§
§ Atty. Dkt.: DEKM:055/PAR
§
§
§
§
§
§

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE	
37 C.F.R. 1.6(d)	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile (703) 305-7362 to Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on the date below:	
October 1, 1996	
Date	David L. Parker

SUPPLEMENTAL PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, 1.127 AND 1.181

Commissioner of Patents
ATTN: BOX AF
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This supplemental petition is submitted to correct several typographical errors that were inadvertently included in the Petition filed September 23, 1996. The present paper is submitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, 1.127 and 1.181 to request the Commissioner to order the

entry of the amendments to the claims presented concurrently with the Reply Brief in the referenced case. Section 1.127 provides that, upon the refusal of the primary examiner to admit an amendment the Applicant may petition to the Commissioner under § 1.181. Section 1.181 sets forth the circumstances under which a petition may be made and the requirements for the contents of the petition.

It is believed that no fee is required, however, should the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks determine that additional fees are necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct said fee from Arnold, White & Durkee Deposit Account No. 01-2508/UTSD:397/PAR.

I. History of the Case

The present application was originally filed on August 25, 1993 with claims 1-67. In the First Official Action dated June 28, 1994, claims 1-67 were rejected. In a Response mailed December 28, 1994, claims 1, 5-46 and 48-49 were canceled without prejudice, claims 2-4, 47, 56, 57 and 61 were amended and a request was made for insertion of text into the specification to partially correct an unintentional deletion of text from the specification.

In the Final Official Action dated April 17, 1995, claims 2-4, 47 & 50-67 were rejected. The Examiner objected to the insertion of text into the specification as new matter under 35 U.S.C. § 132 and required the Applicant to cancel the inserted text.

In a Response to Final Office Action and Request for Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16, mailed June 12, 1995, claims 47, 60 and 63-67 were amended. An Advisory Action

mailed on July 27, 1995 entered the amendments and rejected claims 2-4, 47 and 50-67.

A Notice of Appeal was filed October 10, 1995. Appellants contemporaneously submitted with their Appeal Brief amendments to claims 47, 61, 64 and 67 and canceled without prejudice claim 59 to simplify the issues for appeal. Appellants also contemporaneously filed a Petition to the Commissioner under 37 C.F.R. § 1.181(a) to petition for the entry of new text into the specification as originally requested on December 28, 1994.

An Advisory Action mailed January 31, 1996 rejected claims 2-4, 47, 50-58 and 60-67.

The amendments to claims 47, 61, 64 and 67 and cancellation of claim 59 were entered as they materially reduced the issues under appeal.

On February 8, 1996 the Petition to the Commissioner filed on October 18, 1995 was granted, since the added language was supported by the specification as originally filed and did not change the invention described in the application, it was held not to be new matter.

The Examiner's Answer to Appellant's Brief was mailed on March 7, 1996. A Reply Brief was filed on May 7, 1996. Appellants contemporaneously submitted with their Reply Brief an amendment to claim 66 and a request to cancel without prejudice claims 50, 53 and 54. These claims were dependent upon claims which had been previously amended, leaving claims 50, 53 and 54 without antecedent basis.

In an Advisory Action mailed on July 23, 1996, the Examiner refused to enter the requested amendment to claim 66 and the requested cancellations of claims 50, 53 and 54 on the grounds that further search and/or consideration would be required to determine if new art

would be necessary to meet remaining claim limitations. The Advisory Action indicated that cancellation of claim 50, if presented separately, would be entered. The Examiner also refused to enter the Reply Brief, stating that it was not limited to new points of argument or to new grounds of rejection raised in the Examiner's Answer. A revised Reply Brief is submitted herewith. A separately presented request to cancel claim 50 without prejudice is also submitted herewith. Claims 2-4, 47, 50-58 and 60-67 are presently the subject of appeal.

II. Rules Governing Entry of Amendments After Final Rejection

The rules and guidelines governing the entry of amendments after final rejection and contemporaneously with appeal are straightforward. The rule addressing amendments made after final rejection, 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(a), provides in pertinent part:

(a) After final rejection or action (§ 1.113) amendments may be made canceling claims or complying with any requirement of form which has been made. Amendments presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal may be admitted.

37 C.F.R. § 1.116(a) (1995). Subsection (b) of this rule sets forth the circumstances under which a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the amendments to be entered are necessary and were not earlier presented is required. Appellants submit that such a showing is not necessary in the present case for reasons set forth below.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) sets forth guidelines for examiners to follow when presented with amendments after final rejection and/or upon or after filing of an appeal in §§ 714.13 and 1207. Both of these sections provide that "where an

amendment merely cancels claims, adopts examiner suggestions, removes issues for appeal, or in some other way requires only a cursory review by the examiner," a showing under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b) is not necessary. MPEP §§ 714.13, p. 700-114; 1207, p. 1200-12 (Sept. 1995). Appellants submit that the amendments presented contemporaneously with their Reply Brief had the effect of removing issues for appeal and adopting examiner suggestions and should therefore be entered. Specific facts relating to Appellants position are set forth in Section III below.

MPEP § 714.13 further explains that "[t]he refusal to enter the proposed amendment should not be arbitrary." Moreover, the examiner is required to give the proposed amendment "sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified" and to concisely express her reasons for nonentry of the amendments. MPEP § 714.13, p. 700-114. The Action states that the amendments "raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search." Appellants disagree with this position and explain in more detail below the reasons Appellants believe the amendments should be entered.

III. Facts Involved and Points to be Reviewed

The Advisory Action mailed on July 23, 1996 refused to enter the requested cancellation of claims 53 and 54. The Examiner indicated that such cancellation would raise the issue of new matter, as the removal of this subject matter would affect the scope of the remaining claim limitations, requiring further search and/or consideration to determine if new

art would be necessary.

Appellants note that claims 53 and 54 depend from claim 47. A request to amend claim 47 was filed on October 18, 1995. The amendment was entered in the Advisory Action mailed on January 31, 1996.

The amendment of claim 47 entered on January 31, 1996 read as follows:

47. (three times amended) A fertile, transgenic maize plant, the genome of which has been augmented by the introduction of a DNA composition comprising a selectable or screenable marker gene selected from the group of genes consisting of [a dalapon dehalogenase (*deh*) gene; an anthranilate synthase gene that confers resistance to 5 methyl tryptophan;] an aequorin gene and a gene encoding a cell wall protein, so that the transgenic plant exhibits one or more phenotypic characteristics that render it identifiable over the corresponding untransformed maize plant which does not comprise said gene, and wherein said gene is transmittable through normal sexual reproduction of the transgenic maize plant to subsequent generation plants.

Claims 53 and 54 presently read as follows:

53. The transgenic maize plant of claim 47, wherein the selectable or screenable marker gene comprises a dalapon dehalogenase (*deh*) gene.

54. The transgenic maize plant of claim 47, wherein the selectable or screenable marker gene comprises an anthranilate synthase gene that confers resistance to 5 methyl tryptophan.

Appellants submit that claims 53 and 54 are without antecedent basis following the

amendment of claim 47 entered by the Advisory Action dated January 31, 1996. Specifically, reference in claim 47 to "a dalapon dehalogenase gene" and "an anthranilate synthase gene" has been removed. Neither of these two genes constitutes an aequorin gene or a gene encoding a cell wall protein. Therefore, claims 53 and 54 are without any antecedent basis whatsoever in the currently pending claims. In order to simplify the issues on appeal, Appellants request that the Commissioner order the entry of the amendments.

IV. Conclusion

Appellants respectfully submit that, from the foregoing observations and arguments, the Action's conclusion that the proposed amendments may not be entered is unwarranted. It is therefore requested that the Commissioner order the entry of the amendments in order to simplify issues for appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

David L. Parker
Reg. No. 32,165

ARNOLD, WHITE & DURKEE
P.O. Box 4433
Houston, Texas 77210
(512) 418-3000

Attorney for Appellants

Date: October 1, 1996

APPENDIX A TO SUPPLEMENTAL PETITION

The following changes have been made to the Supplemental Petition:

1. Page 3, lines 3-4: "amendments to claims 47, 61 and 64" has been changed to read "amendments to claims 47, 61, 64 and 67 and canceled without prejudice claim 59".
2. Page 3, line 9: "amendments to claims 47, 61 and 67" has been changed to read "amendments to claims 47, 61, 64 and 67 and cancellation of claim 59".
3. Page 3, line 12: "suppported" has been changed to read "supported".
4. Page 6, line 1: "aret" has been changed to read "art".
5. Page 6, line 5: "January 31, 1995" has been changed to read "January 31, 1996".
6. Page 6, line 21: "antecedant" has been changed to read "antecedent".